



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,431	08/18/2000	Russell A. Wilson	INTL-0434-US (P9442)	6667

7590 12/18/2003  
Timothy N Trop  
Trop Pruner & Hu PC  
Suite 100  
8554 Katy Freeway  
Houston, TX 77024

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

DEC 18 2001

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 12

Application Number: 09/641,431  
Filing Date: August 18, 2000  
Appellant(s): WILSON ET AL.

---

Trop, Pruner & Hu  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed November 4, 2003.

Art Unit: 2174

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 2174

**(7) Grouping of Claims**

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-6, 10-16 and 20-30 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

**(8) Claims Appealed**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

✓ 6,201,859	Memhard et al.	03-2001
✓ 6,349,327	Tang et al.	02-2002
✓ 5,579,521	Shearer et al.	11-1996
✓ 5,195,086	Baumgartner et al.	03-1993
✓ 5,821,925	Carey et al.	10-1998
✓ 6,191,807	Hamada et al.	02-2001
✓ 6,144,991	England, Paul	11-2000
✓ 6,212,547	England, Paul	04-2001
✓ 5,949,414	Namikata et al.	09-1999
✓ 6,252,588	Dawson, John	06-2001
✓ 6,014,135	Fernandes, Antonio M.	01-2000
✓ 6,097,389	Morris et al.	08-2000
✓ 5,428,729	Chang et al.	06-1995
✓ 5,867,156	Beard et al.	02-1999
✓ 6,091,408	Treibitz et al.	07-2000
✓ 5,793,365	Tang et al.	08-1998

Art Unit: 2174

✓ 5,796,395	de Hond, Maurice	08-1998
✓ 5,933,597	Hogan, Michael	08-1999

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-3, 11-13, 20-23 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365) in view of Fernandes (US 6,014,135).

As per claim 1, Tang teaches a method comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window (figs. 3, 5, and 8), the interface including an icon representing a potential object recipient (figs. 3 and 8; *object recipient 21 and 14 respectively*), enabling an object to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping a representation of the object to the icon (figs. 3 and 5; col. 8, lines 36-38), an interface for preparing notes to be transferred from the interface to the communication interface (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 35-37 and fig. 5; col. 9, lines 37-50) and enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note (*element 18 of fig. 1A, element(s) 26 of fig. 5 as well as an appearance of sticky notes in figs. 1B and 3, respectively displayed at the bottom of object 29 and 19*) to be annotated (col. 8, lines 52-54) in order to pass a note to an intended recipient (col. 8, lines 52-56). Tang does not explicitly disclose enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note to be annotated in order to pass a note to an intended recipient and enabling the note interface to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping the note to the icon. Fernandes teaches a method comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window, the interface including an icon

Art Unit: 2174

representing a potential object recipient, enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note to be annotated in order to pass a note to an intended recipient and enabling the note interface to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping the note to the icon (figs. 3-6; col. 11, lines 35-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fernandes method comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window, the interface including an icon representing a potential object recipient, enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note to be annotated in order to pass a note to an intended recipient and enabling the note interface to be transferred to the recipient by dragging-and-dropping the note to the icon to Tang's method of comprising displaying a communications interface in association with a window, the interface including an icon representing a potential object recipient, enabling a user interface in the form of a sticky note to be annotated in order to pass a note to an intended recipient in order to provide users with an implementation preference.

Claims 11, 21 and 29 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 2, Tang teaches a method of providing an icon for each of a plurality of users and enabling communications through the communication interface between the users (figs. 3, 5, and 8; icons such as "Julie" and "Susan" communicating via communication interfaces).

Claims 12, 23 and 30 are individually similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 3, Tang teaches a method of providing a home interface for the users and enabling communications between the users and the home interface using the communications interface (*figs. 3, 5, and 8 and respective portions of the specification*).

Claims 13 and 25 are individually similar in scope to claim 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20 and 28 are individually similar in scope to claim 10 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, Tang teaches a system that includes a display and a mouse coupled to the processor (*fig. 10*).

As per claim 24, Tang teaches a system wherein the storage stores instruction that enable the processor to facilitate communications between users of the same system (*fig. 5 and respective portions of the specification*).

Claims 4, 14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365) in view of Fernandes (US 6,014,135) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of de Hond (US 5,796,395).

As per claim 4, Tang teaches a method of providing access to interfaces, associated with a user, on a user-selected or user initiated basis (col. 8, lines 3-5; col. 10, lines 35-36). Tang does not explicitly disclose providing access to an interface on a password basis. De Hond teaches a method of providing access to interfaces, associated with a user, on a password basis (col. 4, lines 43-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include De Hond's teaching of providing access to interfaces on a password basis to Tang's teaching of providing access to interfaces on a user initiated basis in order to provide users with a more secure environment.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365 in view of Fernandes (US 6,014,135) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Word 2000 ("MS Word").

As per claim 5, Tang teaches a method of depicting miniature version of objects/images a.k.a. thumbnails (figs. 3, 5, and 8). Tang does not explicitly disclose the thumbnails of the objects to be produced when the object is mouse clicked on. MS Word teaches producing a thumbnail depiction of an object when the object is mouse clicked on (figs. 2-3; *object 200, when clicked on with cursor 210, produces a thumbnail depiction 300 of the object as in fig. 3*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of producing a thumbnail as taught by MS Word to Tang's teaching of the use of thumbnails in order to maximize the display area available.

Claims 15 and 26 are individually similar in scope to claim 5 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 6, MS Word teaches a method of attaching a depiction of the object to a cursor so that the depiction moves as the cursor moves (figs. 3-4; *object is attached to a cursor in fig. 3 and moved as displayed in fig. 4*).

Claims 16 and 27 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. ("Tang", US 5,793,365) in view of Fernandes (US 6,014,135) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hogan (US 5,933,597).



As per claim 10, Tang teaches a method of providing a first interface where objects are persistently stored after being transferred from the first interface (fig.5; *objects 26 are stored in interface 24*) and supports operations to delete objects (col. 11, lines 58-59). Tang does not explicitly disclose a second interface where objects are automatically discarded after being transferred from the second interface. Hogan teaches a first interface where objects are stored (fig. 12; *object sharing window 82*) and a second interface where objects are automatically discarded after being transferred (col. 8, lines 35-38; *such as the case wherein text strings are transferred in a drag and drop operation*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include Hogan's teaching of a first interface where objects are stored and a second interface where objects are automatically discarded after being transferred to Tang's method of providing a first interface where objects are persistently stored after being transferred from the first interface and the capability to delete objects in order to provide users with a time-saving method of deleting objects automatically.

**(11) Response to Argument**

Appellant argues that the modified Fernandes and Tang's teaching of creating messages does not disclose the messages to be in the form of an image of a sticky note.

The Examiner disagrees:

Tang teaches creating a message that has text and a user has the capability of directing it to other users (fig. 1A; col. 8, lines 36-38 and lines 52-55). Moreover, the message is in a form representative of a note and, therefore, *is a note*, which a user creates and annotates (fig. 1A, *element 18*). Tang does not explicitly disclose the note to be "sticky"; however, Fernandes

Art Unit: 2174

teaches a drag-and-drop method of transferring messages to an intended recipient (figs. 3-6; col. 11, lines 35-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fernandes' drag-and-drop method of transferring messages to an intended recipient to Tang's method of creating messages having the image of a note, and thus making it a sticky note in accordance with Appellant's definition, in order to facilitate users' access to data and sharing of common resources as well as to facilitate routing of messages.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Le Nguyen  
December 10, 2003

Conferees  
Kristine Kincaid  
Sy D. Luu

Timothy N Trop  
Trop Pruner & Hu PC  
Suite 100  
8554 Katy Freeway  
Houston, TX 77024

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

*Sy D. Luu*  
SY D. LUU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER